



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Not mere conjecture, then, but good evidence exists to show that *Magnyfycence* has a satirical and personal motive, and that the victim intended is not Henry VIII but Wolsey, satirized here by Skelton apparently for the first time. It is worth noting, too, that as Wolsey both received the Cardinal's hat, and was appointed to the Chancellorship in 1515, his supremacy in church and state alike practically dates from this year; so Skelton's attack was not (if we accept *Magnyfycence* as the first manifestation) deferred so long as has been supposed upon the ground that the later *Colin Clout* should be so described.

E. S. HOOPER.

Bryn Mawr College.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

Historia de Gil Blas de Santillana por Lesage, traducida por el Padre Isla, abbreviated and edited with introduction, notes, map and vocabulary, by J. GEDDES, JR., and FREEMAN M. JOSSELYN, JR. Boston, D. C. Heath & Co., 1901.

THE use, in modern language instruction, of texts not originally written in the language to be taught, but translated into it from some other tongue, has frequently been condemned by pedagogical authorities. It has been urged, with some reason, that pupils should be fed only on good literature, should be made familiar from the start with a pure, idiomatic style, and should imbibe through their reading something of the life and spirit of the people whose speech they are trying to acquire. Such texts have, nevertheless, sometimes done admirable service, in the early stages of study, on account of their simplicity of diction and their comparative freedom from rare and perplexing idioms. At the very outset, it is more profitable to the student to master inflectional forms, the ordinary constructions, and the commonest expressions than to meet an overwhelming variety of words and phrases. Now, when a translation offering this advantage is itself a literary masterpiece, and equals in local color any native work, it may surely be accepted without hesitation for use in the class-room. The chief objection to Father Isla's version of

Gil Blas, as an elementary Spanish text, has been its length; in spite of this drawback, and the lack of a convenient edition, it has often made its way into school and college, to the satisfaction of teachers and the delight of pupils. The little volume prepared by Professors Geddes and Josselyn contains one hundred and sixty-three pages of narrative, judiciously selected from Books i-iii and vii-ix. We have here, among other things, the episodes of the robbers and their subterranean retreat, Doctor Sangredo, the Archbishop of Granada, the Duke of Lerma, and the interrupted wedding. In several places, where a proper comprehension of the sequence of events seems to demand it, a few lines of English supply the missing connection; the texture of Lesage's tale is, however, generally so loose that the omission of a chapter or a book or two rarely interferes seriously with the understanding of the next adventure. The editors have provided a map of Spain with an indication of the route taken by our hero, a short introduction (dealing with the author, the place of *Gil Blas* in French literature, and the controversy about its origin), copious notes, and a vocabulary. The value of these last features can be determined only by actual use. Some teachers will object to the assignment of so much space, in the notes, to the explanation of rudimentary matters of vocabulary, syntax, and idiom; but as this is a point upon which doctors disagree, it is perhaps wiser not to express a dogmatic opinion.

C. H. GRANDGENT.

Cambridge, Mass.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

Outlines of the History of the English Language. By T. N. TOLLER, M. A., Professor of English in the Owens College, Manchester. New York, Macmillan Company, 1900. xiv, 284 pp.

PROFESSOR TOLLER's recent book is a not unwelcome addition to the ever-growing series of histories of our language. It gives us a new point of view—that of a lexicographer of Old English—and, oddly enough, this view-point seems peculiarly adapted to revealing the

spirit, rather than the bones, of the language-history, to suggesting the skeleton beneath, while actually showing only the rounded 'outlines.'

The real subject of the book might be stated as 'The English Vocabulary in its relation to the character and the history of the English people;' for, although the forms of the language are by no means entirely neglected, it is the vocabulary which appeals most strongly to the author; and he tends to treat its history from the standpoint of the Foreign Office, rather than from that of the individual speaking Englishman. To quote his preface (p. v.), the author attempts

'to give some idea of the conditions under which language-material was gradually accumulated, was sifted and shaped, before the result was attained which we see in the present speech of England.'

These processes are for him largely conscious processes, to be traced to specific external influences. The 'conditions' involve the entire *Kulturgeschichte* of the race; the 'accumulation' suggests the lexicographer's painful gathering together of words from their various sources—indeed, so strongly is this 'source'-idea entrenched in the author's mind that he can speak (p. 2) of the 'material which is drawn from Old English, Latin and Greek,' as if Old English were still the remote 'Anglo-Saxon,' which, in the dictionaries of fifty years ago, stood for the ultimate in etymology; the 'sifting' is, in Prof. Toller's treatment, largely the work of visible, outward forces; and even the 'shaping' is made, in a very considerable degree, the product of environment, rather than the working out of inborn tendencies. Language as an organism, developing from within in accordance with the great laws which govern all language, has apparently little interest for the author; when he does touch upon this side of his subject, he never fails to be suggestive, but it is laws as explaining phenomena, not phenomena as illustrating laws, which he prefers to present to us. He never forgets that he is writing history—a history, in the most specific sense of the word; and for him history is one thing, science quite another.

To Prof. Toller a word means, in nine cases out of ten, a written word; his book is essen-

tially a history of literary English, of language embalmed, rather than language vocal with life; so far is this true that, except for a few pages on Grimm's Law, introduced for the sake of showing that our language has relatives on the continent of Europe, and four pages (174 ff.) containing a few leading facts of Old English sound-history—just enough to suggest that English 'was shaped out of common Teutonic material'—the book contains no hint of the importance of phonology for an understanding of the phenomena of language. For the early period, the author's account of literary English falls little short of being an account of English literature—in fact, I know no other book in which the close interdependence, the essential unity, of life, literature, and language is so consistently depicted; but it is a little disconcerting to find (p. 170), at the end of twenty pages about the Old English prose-writers, the following words in explanation of their presence:

'A literature that contains so much as is given in the above lists may, taking all the circumstances into account, fairly claim to be spoken of as considerable, and may be expected to afford material from which a knowledge of the language in which it is written can be gained.'

One has wondered all along why all this pleasant reading about Alfred, Ælfric, and the rest; but, if this be the end, the means are certainly a little ponderous; and did the author really suppose his audience to require such extended proof that the Old English language is not a figment of the dictionary-makers?

No one would accuse Prof. Toller's style of belligerency—it presents, for the most part, the extreme of mildness; but it is none the less true that he is ever on the defensive. Though he has built a very substantial structure, he seems to be in constant fear that it will be knocked about his ears, and that any possibility of attack must be deprecated. His preface consists largely of a justification of his subject, a series of proofs that it is worthy of study; and there is hardly a chapter which does not contain, if not an apology for its presence, at least an explanation of its relevancy. This continual self-justification gives the book an air of timorousness which it does not merit, and which inevitably weakens its effectiveness, especially for use in teaching.

In fact, the style in which the book is written is perhaps its greatest fault; though occasionally clear and straightforward, notably in portions of the grammatical chapters, it is almost never strong and incisive, and is for the most part cumbrous, repetitious, and utterly devoid of rhythm, while the sentences are weighted down with a burden of modification which is beyond all propriety. This is carried so far that one leaves the book with a feeling that the author shrinks from a direct statement of fact or opinion; 'may' and 'might' have fairly rained on many of the pages; and statements are frequently so qualified as to be left mere suggestions. As a fair example may be cited a thrice-modified remark in introduction of a list of Old English verbs of Latin origin (p. 92, note 1):

'Excluding two or three which are connected with the Church the following are nearly the only instances of verbs that are at all freely used.'

But suggestion, rather than demonstration, seems to have been the author's ideal in his work; and it is perhaps by the presence of a slight haze that the atmosphere is most often brought to our consciousness—though there is a bracing air which is its own best witness. 'Atmosphere' is certainly a characteristic of the book; we are made to feel, by the process of suggestion, the attitude of the people toward their language at each successive stage of its development, and are made conscious of the inter-play of the different tendencies and forces of which the language at any epoch is a resultant. But we so often become impatient with the leisureliness of the author's method, and with the mountains of evidence, be it never so interesting, which he heaps up in the attempt to make his suggestions inevitable. Thus, when ten pages have been given to suggesting the spread of Latin learning in England before the Conquest, and twelve more to suggesting that many Latin words were adopted into Old English, one is a little taken aback at encountering twelve more pages—and very excellent pages—devoted to suggesting that Old English was in fact remarkably free from Latin influence. Or, after an extended discussion of the relations between English and the Celtic dialects, closing with a list of Celtic borrow-

ings made as exhaustive as possible by the inclusion of a 'catch-all paragraph' from Prof. Skeat, one cannot but suffer a little cooling of his enthusiasm when he reads (p. 50),

'for our purpose the main value (of these lists) does not depend upon their being exact . . . There is no uncertainty in the conclusion that may be drawn from them, namely, that Celtic has only very slightly at any time influenced the vocabulary of English.'

If this were all, pray, why print the lists?

When applied to matters of grammar (Chaps. ii and x), the effects of Prof. Toller's suggestive method are often very happy; he follows the ordinary road of grammarians in a reverse direction, and derives Grimm's Law and suggests trifles like the mutation of vowels by a gentle induction, instead of stating them as the bases for rigid deductive processes. Of many linguistic facts—such as this very mutation—he does not even give us the names; he merely leads us to a more or less distinct realization of their existence. But one questions whether the book would not gain in effectiveness if the inductions were a little clearer, the conclusions a little more definitely stated; and wonders if the novice for whose initiation these linguistic chapters are so admirably adapted will be able to read the copious extracts from Old English—of which, however, translations are given in all cases.

Although the last three chapters of the book—that on Middle English, with its well-chosen quotations and its admirable comparative tables in illustration of the progress of the language; that on the Renaissance period, with its discussion of the entrance of the critical spirit among users of English; and the final chapter, which is almost a treatise on modern English prose style, closing with an apt characterization of newspaper fine writing as the Euphuism of to-day—are all excellent, each in its own way, it is the early period of the language which has chiefly claimed the author's attention, and fully two-thirds of the book are devoted to it. Old English is dear to Prof. Toller's heart, and it is pretty to see his zeal in setting forth the good points of the early language, and in defending it from imaginary assaults. He is so proud of its sturdy independence and native color, of its power of

resisting the intrusion of foreign words, of the Latin lore of the early scholars, and of the fact that all their learning could not vitiate their English. He is, indeed, so apprehensive lest the scarcity of Latin words in Old English be taken to imply ignorance that he devotes most of a chapter (v) to showing the extent of Latin learning in early England. He even finds consolation for the blighting effect of the Danish raids in the fact that they at least 'preserved the language from Latin elements' (p. 139).

When he discusses (p. 202), the terms 'Anglo-Saxon' and 'Old English' as names for the earliest stage of the language, Prof. Toller is rational, if not very conclusive; but in his employment of them he is distinctly funny. He has evidently determined on the use of 'Old English' in the present volume, but an occasional 'A. S.' has crept in (pp. 36, 37, 38, 51, 226), perhaps from the author's 'Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.' However, he more than makes up for this by his extension of the use of 'Old English' from language to life, from words to men. Thus we have (pp. 2, 22) 'Old Englishmen,' instead of 'Anglo-Saxons;' on page 92, we find the statement, 'Most of the work that language had to do in the old English times had to be done by old English material' (why not 'Old,' rather than 'old?'); and (p. 76) Latin is referred to as 'the language in which were written books that were read or composed by the old English scholars.' Dr. Martineau in his later years might perhaps have been spoken of as an old English scholar; Prof. Toller is certainly an Old English scholar; but Bede? Benedict Biscop?—the appellation is undeniably a novel one.

The treatment of Old English poetry as illustrative of tendencies in the early language is most excellent, even though one be not able to entirely escape the feeling that the author is poaching on the preserves of the historian of our literature; to Prof. Toller language and literature are one, and in the chapter (vii), in which he deals with a feature of the language—the early poetic diction—which is now extinct, he is highly successful, as elsewhere, in interpreting the real spirit of the language of a given period, in showing how truly it reflects the life and thought of the people. His quo-

tations throughout the book are selected with much care and judgment; and they are of sufficient length and interest to be suggestive far beyond the limits of 'pure linguistics.' The use made of these quotations is often novel and ingenious: by extended comparison (pp. 112-120) of passages in the Old English *Andreas* with others from the *Beowulf* and other secular poems, the author illustrates the persistence of native and heathen imagery—the imagery of a race of ruthless fighters on the sea—even in the description of the deeds of a Christian hero in a far Eastern land; further passages from *Beowulf* are placed beside quotations from the Old Saxon *Heliand* to show that this permanence and conservatism of the poetic vocabulary is Germanic, not simply English. Again—though this feature is not wholly original—by the use of italics in two of the Old English prose passages (Chap. ix), the author shows the extent to which we are still served by the vocabulary of our ancestors before the Conquest; the italicized words are those which have since dropped out of the language.

Chapters xi and xii portray the gradual evolution of the modern language out of Old English; the steps of the process are well illustrated by extracts from fifteen important texts, beginning with a late entry in the Peterborough *Chronicle*, and closing with a pamphlet by Sir Thomas More. Each of these extracts is followed by a discussion of the points of development to be observed in its vocabulary and the forms of its words; comparisons are made with both Old and Modern English, and we are thus enabled to feel the currents as they increase and diminish in their flow through these four hundred years of our language. The rise of the French influence and the distinctions between the dialects of Middle English are set clearly before us by the use of tables, for example, that on pp. 230 f., which compares the forms of some fifteen words in the Kentish *Ayenbite of Inwyrt*, Robert of Gloucester's *Chronicle*, and Old English. An interesting comparison is that (pp. 264 f.) between Wiclif's and Tyndal's versions of parts of Mark xv; the points of contrast emphasized are two: those resulting from Tyndal's greater freedom from the idiom of his original, and

those which rise from Tyndal's having translated from the Greek, rather than the Latin.

I have spoken of its style as the greatest fault of Prof. Toller's book; but perhaps the utter lack of an index is a greater. There is indeed a table of contents; but it consists only of a reprint of the chapter headings; and though the paragraphs are numbered, there is no means of referring to them, no way—except a marginal summary—of discovering what each contains, or upon what page anything in the book is to be found. One who would seek, for example, a discussion of the verb *to be* would look in vain for any clue to its location. Citations from other authors—which are in the main admirable, especially in the notes to the earlier chapters, where the original Old English or Latin text is always given—are frequently unlocated (as pp. 43, n. 1; 45, top; 53, n. 1; 57, top; 59, n. 1; 128), and, though cross-references are occasionally met with in the text, they are quite as often omitted. In fact, the author seems entirely unconscious of the desirability of making his book easy of reference; he has at least failed to provide any means to that end.

I subjoin notes upon a few further points of detail which seemed to me worthy of remark; the figures refer to pages.

6. The colloquial *heuer* should be added to *heute*, as an example of the pronoun *he* in German.

13. '*Sartor Resartus*, p. 64;' in what edition? This reference may mean something to the author, but it is of little use to the reader.

16. The point of the discussion of 'humour' is lost through a failure to tie up the threads at the end; this is a good example of the author's tendency to dissipate his own effects; he begins excellently, but he does not keep his eye steadily on the *terminus ad quem*; in consequence, that which might just as easily be a victorious capture of a point often deteriorates into a mere interesting ramble.

20. 'The American and the Englishman still for the most part understood one another;' one wonders if Professor Toller has ever been in America, and, if so, whether he found himself so unintelligible as his words would suggest.

31. The 'relation' (of German) 'to the common Teutonic is like that of the latter to Latin;' the implication that 'the common Teutonic' is derived from Latin is unfortunate; a lexicographer should know the tendency of the novice to regard cognates as ancestors, and should have sought to counteract, not to strengthen it. On p. 185, there is, to one who is not on his guard, a similiar implication.

38 (line 2). The parenthesis '(cf. Lat. *lupus*)' belongs after *wolf*.

61 f., §13. Professor Toller here discusses the question of the Jutes and the probable character of their language; from the absence of the ending *-by* in Kentish place-names, he concludes that it cannot have been closely allied to the Scandinavian dialects.

73 ff. This translation from the preface to the *Pastoral Care* closely follows that in Sweet's edition, with a few changes in the direction of literalness; an acknowledgment would have been graceful.

77. Is not Winfrid, the great 'apostle to the Germans,' as worthy of mention here as Wictbert and Wilbrord?

79 ff. This exhaustive list of Old English words derived from Latin is unquestionably of value; but its ten pages seem out of proportion to the lesson drawn from them (pp. 91 f.), that 'the Latin material which made its way into general use was really inconsiderable.' The proper place for this list would be an appendix—perhaps most suitably an appendix to the author's Dictionary.

94, §8. In saying that 'foreign material was most likely to find a place among words connected with religion,' the author apparently forgets that the early monks were missionaries; in introducing Christianity to a strange and uncouth race, men have ever attempted to make its concepts simple, to bring the new religion as close as possible to the lives of the people,¹ and to make it real and tangible to even the rudest hearer. To this end its terminology must be made intelligible and so far as may be self-explanatory; and without doubt one of the things to which both Roman and Celtic missionaries devoted

¹ On these points, cf. Gregory's instructions to Augustine, contained in his letter to Mellitus (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* i, xxx), and Aidan's advice in council (*ibid.*, iii, v).

most affectionate care was this very invention of English expressions for religious and ecclesiastical ideas. The case was far different with the Norman clergy in the train of the Conquest; they came to a people already Christian, and no longer requiring—even had the new-comers been disposed for this—that the words of Gospel and Church be thus anxiously adapted to their unaccustomed ears. They came in the pride of a race proved superior by force of arms, bent on establishing a splendid Norman hierarchy to correspond to William's monarchy; and to this end what better means than a whole new ecclesiastical vocabulary—one now calculated, not to win the hearts of the people, to bring them near to their pastors, but rather to emphasize the distance between shepherd and flock, to show the superiority of the rich and cultured Norman clergy, with their speech drawn from Rome, to the native priests who used the every-day language of the common folk?

94 ff. The tables here, comparing Old with Modern English ecclesiastical and technical terms, are admirably suggestive of the great contrast, made prominent throughout the book, between the eclecticism of the Modern English vocabulary and the purity and conservatism of that of Old English.

155. Transpose, in the sentence beginning at line 5, 'original composition' and 'translation.'

175 f. A suggestion of the author's attitude toward the phonetic aspect of language may be gained from the fact that in giving lists of the vowels in Old English and in 'common Teutonic,' he furnishes no hint as to their pronunciation.

182 ff. The sections on declension, while full of material and of suggestion, would require much amplification by the teacher if they were to furnish anything more than a conviction of the two characteristic facts in the history of English inflection: 'continuousness of change and constancy of direction.'

204. While Professor Toller often suggests, he nowhere explicitly mentions the genius of the Northmen for self-assimilation in the matter of language; both Danes in England and Normans in France speedily relinquished the language which they brought for that

which they found. The Northmen of the Viking age, with no home but the sea, no written literature, no stable institutions, nothing, in short, about which language should crystallize, seem to have felt that language belonged to the soil, and that settlement in a country involved adoption of its tongue; the spirit of adventure, the desire to turn their conquests to the best possible account, would also contribute to make them learn the language of the conquered. They learned it ill enough, doubtless—Norman-French was bad French, the English of the Danelagh bad English;—but the race-genius demanded that they learn it. Cnut and William were alike in wishing to be *English* Kings; Cnut's laws were written in English, he ruled his empire from his English capital, and his song about the monks of Ely is a part of English literature; while, according to Ordericus Vitalis, William made at least an effort to learn English at the age of forty-three. But the Normans coming to England were on a far different footing from the Danes; they were no longer Vikings, but had been French dukes for a century and a half—they possessed already a settled home, fixed institutions, stable wealth, and the conservatism which these bring; the 'Chanson de Roland' was sung before the troops on the day of Hastings, and the Normans felt themselves the bearers of a higher civilization, a superior culture, evidenced in no wise more clearly than by the language of which they were so proud; yet, even so, it was English that triumphed in the end—the Northman took the language of the soil.

205. Professor Toller fails to point out the reasons why Gaul adopted the language of Rome, while Britain did not. Southern civilization had been present in Gaul since the foundation of the Greek Massilia in the sixth century B. C.; and for six hundred years Gaul was one of the most important provinces of the Roman Republic and Empire, and was more intimately connected with Roman life than any other northern province. It adjoined Italy, and the currents of Roman trade and culture flowed freely throughout its extent; it was the home of a great number of colonists, its life centered on the Tiber. Britain, on the other hand, was the last-acquired province of

the Empire, the most remote and inhospitable, and the only one, excepting Dacia, from which the Roman troops and officials were voluntarily withdrawn; moreover, the island was never wholly subjugated. When the Anglo-Saxons came, it was to an independent Celtic land which had been under the temporary rule of a people from far over seas, whose influence had been largely external—something like the influence of England in Egypt to-day; the Britons had been cast off by the Romans, and thrown upon their own native resources. The Franks, on the other hand, came to a land Celtic indeed, but still an integral part of the Empire of which it had been a province for six centuries. Is it strange that they found a people more Latinized than did the Anglo-Saxons?

219. *Dēad*, *hēold*; it is gratifying to note that Professor Toller now places the macron over the first vowel of these diphthongs, instead of over the second, as in his Dictionary.

266, note 1. Professor Toller has misunderstood the author: More, in saying 'No aunswere' the question framed by the affirmative, is not stating a principle of correct usage, but is describing Tyndal's error in using *No* as answer to such a question.

There are slight misprints on pp. 41 (7th line from foot), where *influence* should be *inference*; 135, n. 2, *Prænda-lög* for *þrændalög*; 177, *gamfto* for *samfto*; and 188, *patris* for *fratris*.

Throughout the book, there has been forced upon my mind a comparison with Professor Emerson's *History of the English Language*, a book which I have used with my classes; it has seemed to me that a suggestion of this might not be without use to teachers.

Professor Toller views language primarily in relation to men—to their life and their writings; to Professor Emerson, language is an independent organism and is considered largely apart from those who employ it, except so far as their vocal apparatus is concerned. In the one case the written, in the other the spoken word is the basis of study. To Professor Emerson, the forms of words make the chief appeal; to Professor Toller, their meanings and their employment.

Professor Toller states facts about our lan-

guage, tells *that* things are thus and so; Professor Emerson tells *why* they are so, states principles. His book may be described as an introduction to linguistic science by way of the English language—its attitude is that traditionally known as German; Professor Toller's book is English in method, and is more nearly a chronicle. Professor Emerson, to whom the language is interesting chiefly as illustrative of the great laws of language, naturally treats his subject topically, gives, as it were, vertical sections of the language-history, displaying one phenomenon at a time. To Professor Toller, on the other hand, language is primarily a reflection of national life and history; and he treats it chronologically, giving horizontal sections which exhibit the state of the whole language at suggestive points of time.

Each method has its advantages: Professor Toller's book is probably of more popular interest, and has more 'atmosphere'; but Professor Emerson's history will make the student stronger, will help him to a broader, firmer grasp of language as a whole, will teach him that it is alive, and give him a keen interest in the speech of those about him—the speech of those who are making language-history, here and now; while from Professor Toller's book he will be more likely to get the impression that our language has been made, that its history is a thing of the past, and that it is interesting chiefly in the pages of a Shakespeare, a Chaucer, or an Alfred.

FRANK H. CHASE.

Bates College.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Premières Lectures en prose et en vers . . ., selected by JULES LAZARE, London: Hachette & Company, 1900. 12mo. 103 + 26 pp.

UNDER the above title M. Lazare has included some thirty-five stories and half as many lyrics. A glance at the list of authors, where we find, among others, A. Karr, G. Paris, Diderot, Richépin, Voltaire, Stendhal, Victor Hugo, P. Arène and Lemaitre, shows that the collector has gathered good things regardless of period or plan, yet the collection, intended for beginners, cannot fail to interest discrim-